

REMARKS**Objection to Claims 27-41 and 43-50 for lacking unity of invention**

Claim 43 has been amended to change three degrees of freedom to two degrees of freedom to provide unity of invention to method claims 27-41 and 43-50 with apparatus claims 66, 67, 42 and 51-65.

Rejection of Claims 42, 51-67 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 42 and 51-67 for non-obviousness in view of U.S. App. Pub. No. 2004/0102723 to *Horst*. Applicants respectfully disagree with this indication as the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness.

The Examiner has not assembled a combination which teaches each and every element of the independent claims of the application. For example, independent claims 66 and 43 recite an apparatus that includes an actuator which provides movement in at least two degrees of freedom.

In contrast, the cited reference specifically states that in order to provide more than one degree of freedom, more than one actuator must be provided. See Para. [0040]. The Examiner has not provided any other reference or evidence in combination with the cited reference for a rehabilitation device that includes a single actuator that provides movement in at least two degrees of freedom and there is no reason provided in the reference to have one, since it is clearly stated that multiple degrees of freedom is addressed by multiple actuators, one for each degree of freedom.

An allowance of claims 27-67 is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the claims are not in a condition for allowance, but that the issues can be resolved expediently through a telephone conference, the Examiner is welcome to call the undersigned in order to come to a resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
Registration No. 56437
Telephone: 718.246.8482

February 15, 2012